Applicant: Marmaros et al.
Serial No.: 10/750,183
Filed: December 31, 2003

Page : 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 35-43 were pending as of the action mailed on April 29, 2008. Claims 1 and 35 are in independent form. Claim 1 is been amended to incorporate the subject matter of previously pending claims 2 and 3, and claims 2 and 3 are cancelled. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the frames in the frame set are simultaneously displayed. Claim 35 is amended to conform to the amendment to claim 1.

No new matter has been added; support can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraphs 31, 43, 50 and 51; and originally filed claims 1 and 2.

Reexamination of the application and reconsideration of the action are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Examiner Interview Summary

The undersigned conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner on July 29, 2008. During this interview, the undersigned presented arguments that U.S. Patent No. 6,763,496, issued to Hennings et al. ("Hennings") did not anticipate claim 3, as Hennings did not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of "at least one search result [including] a plurality of snippets extracted from the search result document and wherein the instruction is to generate a plurality of frames each displaying at least a portion of at least one of the snippets within the search result document." In particular, Hennings does not teach the use of frames to display snippets extracted from the search result document.

The Examiner stated that Fig. 2 of Hennings showed a "search result" (the homepage 100) and two "frames" (the page 118, which is referenced by link 112 on the homepage 100, and the page 128, which is referenced by the link 122 on the page 118). The undersigned explained that the term "frame" is a term of art, i.e., that frames are sections of a single page as defined by a frame set, and thus Henning did not anticipate claim 3. The Examiner, however, maintained her rejection.

The Examiner stated that an amendment that specified that all the frames were displayed as part of the search result, i.e., simultaneously displayed, would distinguish over Hennings. The

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-1317001 / GP-178-00-US

Applicant: Marmaros et al. Serial No.: 10/750,183 Filed: December 31, 2003

Page : 7 of 8

undersigned stated that such an amendment was not necessary, but would nevertheless consider the amendment to expedite prosecution.

II. Amended Claims 1 and 35 Distinguish Over Hennings

Claims 1 and 35 have been amended to recite that the search result includes a plurality of snippets extracted from the search result document, and that the instruction causes a browser to simultaneously display a plurality of frames in a frame set, each frame corresponding to a different corresponding one of the snippets and displaying at least a portion of the snippet, and to navigate directly to a portion of one of the snippets within the search result document when that snippet is selected by a user.

Hennings does not include any teaching of the simultaneous display frames defined by a frame set and a corresponding snippet displayed in each frame. The web pages 118 and 128 in Fig. 2 of Hennings are not simultaneously displayed, and are not frames defined in a frame set.

For this reason, allowance of claims 1 and 35, and all claims depending therefrom, is requested.

III. Conclusion

The allowability of all of the pending claims has been addressed. The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

Applicant: Marmaros et al. Serial No.: 10/750,183 Filed: December 31, 2003 Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-1317001 / GP-178-00-US

Page : 8 of 8

Please apply any charges not otherwise paid or any credits to Deposit Account No. 06-

1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/29/8

Paul E. Franz Reg. No. 45,910

Customer No. 26192

Telephone: (404) 892-5005 Facsimile: (404) 892-5002

12070315.doc